



**MINISTÈRE  
DE L'AGRICULTURE  
ET DE L'ALIMENTATION**

*Liberté  
Égalité  
Fraternité*

# **ENRD WEBINAR ON 'PREPARING THE CAP STRATEGIC PLANS: DESIGNING INTERVENTIONS'**

**Group III. Cooperation (LEADER)**

***November 25th, 2020***

# Introduction

- Since November 2019, France shared with the Geo-Hub 5 intervention fiches (fictitious) to fully understand the expectations of DG AGRI.
- In return: we got 45 comments from the Geo Hub.
- **Our main question: how to maintain the strategic nature of the national plan, which has to remain concise ?**
- **4 topics to be clarified to ensure real simplification of the future CAP.**

# 1. Strategic approach

- DG AGRI: « *to demonstrate how one intervention will tackle needs* ».
- Comments FR: Part 2 of the Strategic plan describes the strategy by specific objectives. Explaining how this intervention fits into the strategy will not concur to the readability of the intervention fiche.
- Practical solution: to explain the strategy (and the links between needs and interventions) only in part 2 of the plan to limit its length (and not in the intervention fiche).

## 2. Eligibility conditions

- **DG AGRI**: « *Specify a set of eligibility conditions that apply to each intervention. The eligibility conditions must be consistent with the objective of the intervention while avoiding to establish overly complex conditions* ».
- **Comments FR**: expected level of information is too detailed.
- **Practical solution**: intervention fiche specifies the general implementation framework as requested in Article 99 (targeted beneficiaries, operational objectives of the intervention, contribution to results, unit amount, etc.) but without specifying the implementation rules (to avoid modifying the fiches too frequently) :
  - selection criteria must be set outside the intervention fiche for the sake of simplification (ie in calls for proposal) and
  - these criteria will be consistent with the intervention fiche.

# 3. Potential beneficiaries

- **DG AGRI** : « *Clarify the specific beneficiaries targeted to help assess the relevance of the intervention* ».
- **Comments FR**: expected level of information is too detailed. Detailed targeted beneficiaries should not be set in the SP, which is a strategic document.
- **Practical solution**: calls for projects launched at the regional level will specify the targeted beneficiaries (which can evolve according to the themes or actions that can be funded), without having to modify the Strategic Plan at each call for proposal.

# 4. Linking LEADER to the results

- DG AGRI: « *After the selection of LAGs, milestones/targets of the Results indicators (relevant with regard to the strategies of the selected LAGs) should be updated (modification of the Strategic plan) ».*
- Comments FR: this « good practice » will be too cumbersome to operate. It is almost impossible to quantify ex ante the contribution of operations financed by LAGs.
- Practical solution: LEADER could contribute to a limited number of result indicators; its contribution should not be planned but only measured after the completion of the financed operations (annually, ex post).